REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16. Claims 1 and 16 are amended herein, and new claim 17 is added. Claims 9-15 are cancelled herein without prejudice. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1-8, 16 and 17 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,548,506 (Srinivasan). As mentioned above, claims 9-15 are cancelled herein.

Srinivasan is directed to coordinating the management of a project such as receiving project updates and status changes, compiling project plans, etc. For example, users that are participating in a project send an electronic mail regarding status updates of projects to the Auto Multi-Project Server which in turn sends back electronic mail reminders and management reports (see, col. 6, lines 35-45 and col. 7, lines 13-20). That is, Srinivasan is limited to simply planning and monitoring of project information such as project names, leader names, task names and current situations.

In contrast to Srinivasan, the claimed invention stores software components of a default software in a solution bank, customizes and installs the default software. As such, the claimed invention provides a solution for construction of desired software systems in an efficient manner.

Independent claim 1 recites, "storing information about development situations, know-how, and knowledge in a solution bank at the center by a unit of a solution pattern", where the information includes "software components of a default software system." Claim 1 further recites, "customizing the default software system" and "downloading contents including the software components of the default software system corresponding to a desired software system to install the default software system in the computer."

Similarly, independent claim 16 recites, "a solution-pattern providing program with a solution bank, which stores information about development situations, know-how, and knowledge by a unit of a solution pattern at the center", where the information includes "software components and the default software system is "customized." Claim 16 further recites, "a system-construction program with a system-construction device that downloads contents, including the software components of the default software system, corresponding to a desired

software system from the solution bank to install the default software system so as to construct the desired software system."

Srinivasan does not teach or suggest storing "software components of a default software system stored in a solution bank" including "customizing" the default software and installing the software, as recited in independent claims 1 and 16.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Srinivasan.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Srinivasan. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, claim 8 recites, "checking components incorporated into a default system which is used as a basis for the desired system" and "utilizing the checked components for a computer in which another system is to be constructed."

Srinivasan does not teach or suggest, "checking components incorporated into a default system" and "utilizing the checked components for a computer in which another system is to be constructed", as recited in claim 8.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New claim 17 is added to recites, "... customizing the default software at a solution center based on development situations and software components indicated by a customer, said customizing being prior to delivery of the default software" and "installing the customized default software to corresponding one or more computers of the customer."

Srinivasan does not teach or suggest, "customizing the default software at the solution center based on development situations and software components... prior to delivery of the default software" and "installing the customized default software to corresponding one or more computers of the customer", as recited in claim 17.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over Srinivasan.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 08/08/2006

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501